

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action of November 14, 2007 Claims 1-4, 6-16, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious based on the Brown reference (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2005/0190,199) and Chen reference (U.S. Patent 7,215,782). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. Claims 5 and 17 are objected to as being dependent claims based upon a rejected base claim.

In this amendment applicant amends independent Claims 11 and 14. The amendment to Claim 11 clarifies the limitation of an audience presentation being visual or tactile as described in applicant's specification paragraphs 10, 49, and 64 and shown in figures 5, 6, 7, and 8. The amendment to Claim 14 clarifies that the visual or tactile presentation in the preamble is the presentation in item d. of the claim. There is no new matter in these amendments.

The rejection of independent Claims 1, 8, and amended claims 11, and 14 does not make the prima facie case. Neither the Brown or the Chen references teach the following claim limitations:

[Claim 1] "...providing an audience with a visual or tactile presentation representative of perceived sound..."

"b...a processor instructed to perform a human-like auditory transformation on the digital signals..."

"c...the processor further instructed to perform a time-sequence scaling of each channel"

"d...multi-channel visual or tactile presentation controls..."

[Claim 8] "...visual or tactile presentation that is representative of the human perception of sounds..."

"b... a human-like auditory transformation of the signal..."

"c.... time-sequence scaling the transformed signal;"

"d... a visual or tactile presentation..."

[Claim 11] "b. performing a human-like auditory transformation of the signal..."

"c. time-sequence scaling the transformed signal;"

"d... an output signal for audience visual or tactile presentation of the transformed signal..."

[Claim 14] “A device for providing a visual, or tactile presentation...”

“b... a human-like auditory transformation of the acoustic signal...”

“c... time-sequence scaling the transformed signal...”

“d... audience visual or tactile presentation of the transformed signal.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, independent claims 1, 8, 11, and 14 are allowable claims. Since these claims are allowable, the objection to dependent claims 5 and 17 is moot as they are dependant on an allowable claim.

Since independent Claim 1 is an allowable claims, dependent claims 2-4 and 6 and 7 are also allowable claims. Since independent Claim 8 is an allowable claim, dependent claims 9 and 10 are allowable claims. Since independent Claim 11 is an allowable claim, claims 12 and 13 are allowable claims. Since independent Claim 14 is an allowable claim, claims 15, 16, and 18, 19 are allowable claims.

A telephone interview was held with the examiner on April 18, 2008 during which the above arguments and claim amendments were discussed. Agreement was reached that the claims as amended were allowable over the references presented.

In summary, the Office Action does not make the prima facie case. Applicant has shown that the claims, as amended, are allowable claims, and that action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted:

/William Keyworth/

William Keyworth
Reg. No. 47704
(415) 397-8056